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Measuring the Performance of School Resource Officers

A major area of concern for the Colorado Springs Police Department (CSPD) is the performance of its School Resource Officers (SROs) with their overall duties. In the companion section to this report, we described the activities of SROs in five high schools as they engaged in problem-oriented policing projects (POP). As we learned, however, problem-oriented policing is one aspect of what SROs do in Colorado Springs. From interviews with officers and their supervisors and observations of their work, we know that their activities are much broader than one or two POP projects.

What are the measures for evaluating the performance of SROs? How do we decide upon and define those things that are important enough to measure? These questions and issues exist within police departments across the country, whether those departments are grappling with measures for SROs, community policing officers or “traditional” officers.

In this paper we discuss our current understanding of SRO activities, raise measurement issues about SROs, and provide CSPD with surveys and other measurement instruments. We make recommendations about what to measure and how to do so.

School Resource Officers

The events at Columbine High School in Littleton, CO and at other schools across the nation have increased the number of police officers in schools. We estimate that about 6,500 police agencies employ at least one full-time sworn SRO, with many large agencies employing two or more officers in that capacity. We estimate about 13,300 SROs work nationwide. The concept of a school resource officer first emerged in the
1950s in Flint, MI (Girouard, 2001) and slowly evolved over time. The state of Florida is credited with expanding the program in the 1960s and 1970s, but it took another 20 years before SROs gained momentum nation-wide. Over the last five years, SROs have become an important tool toward improving school safety.

**What we know about SROs**

More and more information is now available about SRO activity. Surveys conducted by the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) and through the National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools (NSDPS) provide a picture of SRO work. Evaluations of a number of programs in schools by the Gottfredsons in the past 15 years, and two recent evaluations of SROs in New Hampshire and in Fort Collins, CO provide useful information about programs that work and the effectiveness of SROs. But many questions remain unanswered about the specific roles and responsibilities of SROs, the best type of training necessary for them, and how effective they are in conducting their activities. Measuring their performance is also unclear.

A major source of information about SROs comes from a survey of North Carolina SROs and informal surveys of attendees at a conference of the National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO) conducted by the Center for the Prevention of School Violence (CPSV, 1996; Riley and McDaniel, 1999). In North Carolina, SROs indicated that half of their time was spent in law enforcement duties such as foot patrols and inspections, almost all carry guns and three-quarters wear uniforms. The North Carolina SROs spent a third of their time “counseling” and 17% of time teaching. In a survey conducted by NASRO and the National School Safety and Security
Services during a convention of the NASRO, Trump (2001) found that at least half of the job of SROs consisted of “preventative duties with 56 percent of them describing their role as a 50/50 mix of preventative and reactionary duties and 35 percent of them saying that the majority of their role deals with proactive, preventative duties.” Only 7 percent of the SROs said that the majority of their emphasis is on enforcement and investigation duties.

The surveys indicate that officers provide some counseling or teaching as part of their duties, but specific details and definitions of counseling or teaching are not given. It is worth noting, however, that counseling is not among the crime prevention activities for which evidence of effectiveness was found in recent reviews (D. Gottfredson 1997; D. Gottfredson, Wilson and Najaka, 2001). Some forms of instruction intended to prevent crime (and problem behavior more generally) have been found to be effective when implemented fully and well, but it is clear that many prevention activities in schools involving instruction are not implemented with enough quality to be effective (D. Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1999; G. Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1999).

Reports from the North Carolina survey accounts for all of officer time in three areas -- law enforcement, counseling, and teaching. These three activities appear to be emphasized in the training curricula of the Center for School Safety, which refers to a triad of work -- as law enforcement officer, law-related counselor/advisor, and law-related education teacher. The NASRO training material for SROs also speaks of a triad of roles of law enforcement officer, counselor, and educator, and participants receive training in the role of “counselor or problem solver” (NASRO, 1999).¹ A focus on these

---

¹This appears to help individual youths with problems rather than being a reference to problem-oriented policing or the application of anything like the SARA model.
three pre-defined areas presumably produced the result that activities in enforcement, counseling, and teaching add to 100% of officer’s time. We cannot tell how much of SRO time is devoted to such things as problem-oriented policing, school or community surveys, planning together with school personnel or students to solve problems, and so on.

Research on school safety and delinquency prevention implies that it may be these general planning, program development, and problem-solving activities that hold the most potential for crime prevention and school safety. Problem schools are often overwhelmed, despite the heroic efforts of educators to cope with them (D. Gottfredson, Gottfredson, and Skroban, 1998; G. Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1987).

Effective programs to reduce disorder have, nevertheless, been demonstrated in schools with multiple problems. In one of these (D. Gottfredson, 1988), a structured planning and problem-solving method (G. Gottfredson, 1984) similar to but somewhat more complex than the SARA model was applied in a three-year effort to reduce disorder in a troubled Baltimore City school. The program designed and implemented interventions to increase the predictability of responses to disciplinary infractions, increase rewards for appropriate behavior, and increase social support. The program reduced disorder.

The same problem solving and planning method was applied in programs in seven secondary schools (D. Gottfredson, 1988) to develop school-specific plans for improvement. The effort increased the clarity and consistency of school rules, student success, and attachment; and by reducing problem behavior it improved staff morale. In another study, eight schools participated in a program to increase the clarity of school
rules and to promote their application in a fair, firm, and consistent way (D. Gottfredson, G. Gottfredson, and Hybl, 1993). Again, in the context of a planning and problem-solving framework, mechanisms for attending to and responding to student behavior were improved. Evaluation showed that the program's effectiveness differed from school to school in approximate proportion to the quality of program implementation. In addition, problem solving and planning were effective in reducing conduct problems in high implementation schools.

Related approaches to reducing problem behavior on the way to and from school have been attempted in several places. G. Gottfredson, Gore, and Jones (1998) engaged school faculty and students in planning to prevent problem behavior and improve attendance in a very unsafe school. After two years, attendance rose about 5% above historical levels and teacher morale and school safety improved dramatically, although the school remained very disorderly.

Another source of information about what SROs do comes from the National Study of Delinquency Prevention in Schools (NSDPS) (G. Gottfredson, et al., 2000). A national sample of schools was surveyed to learn about their programs to prevent delinquency and promote school safety. Seventy-four percent of the programs had uniformed officers, 27% had plain clothed officers, and less than 1% used undercover officers (a few schools reported more than one dress style). In contrast to the North Carolina survey, officers carried guns in 80% of the schools, and another weapon in 73%. In 86% of schools officers were expected to make arrests. Interestingly, officers were expected to challenge every offense in only 50% of the schools. The NSDPS also provided information from programs in which police personnel assist in instruction. In
73% of these the officers teach. In addition, officers consult with teachers on general classroom management practices and procedures (32%), consult with teachers experiencing difficulties to improve classroom management (30%), develop plans for in-classroom management of students who present behavior problems (21%), consult with administrators on classroom management programs (30%), assist teachers with classroom tasks (7%), assist in communication with students’ homes (52%), and assist with students whose primary language is not English (3%).

Two evaluations of SRO programs have recently come to light. One study examines SROs in nine high schools in New Hampshire (Humphrey and Huey, 2001), and the second looks at the effects of four SROs in Fort Collins, CO (Foster and Vizzard, 2000). In New Hampshire, researchers conducted a longitudinal study of SROs, measuring officer effectiveness at one and two year intervals. Using surveys of students and teachers, Humphrey and Huey found that fights decreased, fewer students reported smoking marijuana, and fewer students reported bullying behavior. Most students had favorable attitudes toward police officers both prior to and after the arrival of SROs at their school. Of the teachers who reported feeling unsafe prior to the presence of SROs at the school, 74 percent reported feeling safe one year after their arrival and continued to feel safe two years after the institution of the SRO program. Additionally, teachers reported that drug activity, gang behavior, and disruptions declined in the two years of the SRO program. Teachers agreed that their schools were better places to learn with the presence of the SRO and were comfortable reporting problems to the SRO.

In Fort Collins, the research team conducted student, staff, and parent surveys. They also reviewed SRO log sheets that tallied activities. Overall 70% of the high school
respondents said that the SRO was a “somewhat or very positive member” of their school community. At the same time, however, most high school students reported that they had little involvement or interaction with the SROs or the program and “appear to lack an understanding about their [SROs] role or responsibilities” (Foster and Vizzard, 2000:11). Junior high students were more comfortable in approaching their SRO than high school students. They also felt that their personal safety had increased somewhat or greatly because of the SRO presence. School staff members demonstrated a high level of understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the SRO. The researchers believe that this occurred because staff had the most opportunity to interact with the SRO.

**School-Based Activities in Colorado Springs**

In Colorado Springs the School Resource Officer (SRO) program began in earnest in 1999. The model for this program was an officer who began working in Harrison High School in 1995 on a part-time basis. With funding from the COPS Office in 1999\(^2\) and with funds from the schools and the police department, 12 SROs now work fulltime in 12 of the 13 high schools in Colorado Springs.\(^3\) The primary goal of the SROs is to “help provide a safe and secure environment in and around the schools.”

All school-based officers are supervised by a sergeant as part of the Neighborhood Policing Unit (NPU) at each division. The SRO positions are competitive and advertised internally. Officers apply for the positions and are selected by the commander, lieutenant and sergeant at each station.

---

\(^2\) Through the Cops in Schools program and the School-Based Problem Solving grant, officers were hired and equipment purchased.

\(^3\) The remaining high school is for deaf students and does not require an officer on campus.
School Resource Officers in Colorado Springs wear “a zillion hats.” In our interviews and observations of SROs we found that they are called upon to be disciplinarians, counselors, surrogate dads and moms, coaches, enforcers, and educators. As one officer put it, “we are community police officers in the truest sense.” SROs make contact with neighboring businesses and residents to alleviate problems created by students before, during, and after school. They interact with security personnel, students, teachers, staff, and administrators. In some instances, SROs talk with school board members or superintendents of the school district. As part of the police department they work with the officers who patrol the area as well as detectives who may become involved in a crime in and/or around the school. At the same time, they work alone – they are isolated from their fellow police officers and therefore, misunderstood by some officers within the department in terms of their work and time schedules.

What do we expect SROs to do?

As an application of community policing ideas, school resource officers are expected to interact with the community, engage in problem-oriented policing (POP), and serve to a certain degree as agents of change within their organizations (Maguire, et al., 1999). While a variety of definitions and explanations of community policing exist, it is generally agreed that it includes three elements: community interaction and engagement, problem solving, and organizational adaptation (see for example, Bayley, 1994 and the Community Policing Consortium, 1994).

Community engagement means that school resource officers are working closely with the residents and businesses in the area, and with students, teachers, staff, and
parents at the school. Combined with problem-oriented policing this means that SROs ought to engage their school communities in identifying problems, analyzing their causes, formulating responses, and assessing the effectiveness of these responses. It means that officers should be working with other agencies to solve problems in schools as well as collaborating with school officials and students to deal with specific problems.

Generally, problem solving or problem oriented policing (POP) emphasizes the preconditions for crime and preventing or reducing the convergence of offenders and targets of crime in place and time. POP recommends itself as a method of effective policing by its rational approach to problem definition, analysis, action, and assessment of results. Evidence implies that this approach is effective.

In addition to working with the community and problem solving, the school resource officer may also serve as an example of how community policing can change the way in which officers behave. Under the community policing philosophy police organizations are urged to implement a more democratic management style and to alter their traditional organizational structures. These changes, according to reformers, are essential internal steps in improving external service delivery. The goal is to create a flexible, non-bureaucratic organization in which individual officers and supervisors feel free to take initiative and design custom solutions to unique local problems. Theoretically, under community policing, SROs should have more freedom to develop special programs and customize responses to problems within schools. To a certain extent, the SRO is the ‘chief’ on school property and in many respects is responsible for the safety of those who set foot on campus.
How do we measure what they do?

Given these activities, multiple roles and responsibilities, and expectations how do we measure SRO performance?

It appears that both traditional and non-traditional methods are appropriate. That is, crime rates, calls for service, and disciplinary action (collected by schools) can assist in determining certain aspects of SRO performance. Non-traditional measures including student, teacher, citizen and business surveys should be used to provide a picture of performance. The current use of a questionnaire to school administrators is also valuable. The idea is to combine traditional and non-traditional measures so that a complete picture is attained. We do not suggest that all aspects of SRO activities should or would be measured. This would be time-consuming and ill advised.

We recommend that commanders, supervisors, SROs, and school officials work together to determine the specific goals and objectives of the overall SRO program. Second, we recommend that supervisors and SROs develop specific goals for themselves and the schools they work in. These goals should be reasonable and measurable.

Measurement Instruments

To assist SROs and supervisors in measuring their performance, we have developed surveys for students and teachers/staff.

Student survey (Appendix A). The objectives of the survey are to measure students’ familiarity and comfort with the SRO and to determine student perspectives on school safety. Questions that focus on levels of fear and safety are outcome based, that is, they address the overarching goal of the SRO program. Questions about familiarity
with the SRO address the visibility and accessibility of the officer to students. The survey should be administered to all students annually.

Over time, this survey can measure changes in levels of fear and safety as well as attitudes toward SROs and familiarity with them.

**Teacher/Staff survey (Appendix B).** This survey is similar to the student survey in that the objectives of the teacher survey are to measure familiarity with the SRO and measure outcomes. In addition, questions are asked regarding specific problems in the school to assist the SRO in targeting locations or issues. The survey should be conducted annually. Over time, this survey can measure changes in levels of fear and safety as well as attitudes toward SROs and familiarity with them.

**Administration Survey (Appendix C).** NPU sergeants at Sand Creek and Falcon currently use this survey, with slight differences in the meaning of the scale for each question. The objective is to obtain feedback from administrators who work closely with the SROs. Most of the questions focus on the way in which the officer acts and presents him or herself. The survey should be completed at the end of each semester.

**Measuring Problem Oriented Policing.** The most well known method for implementing POP is the SARA model. Because this model follows specific steps and establishes goals and objectives for specific problems, it can be a useful tool for measurement.

During the Scanning phase, officers and other members of the problem-solving team must identify a specific problem at a specific location. There are a variety of methods for identifying the problems to be solved. Police can talk with students, teachers, staff, community residents, business people, or other officers. They can check
calls-for-service or examine data from disciplinary records. The idea is to narrow the scope of the problem so that it is manageable and reasonable to deal with. At this stage, “stakeholders” or those who have something invested in the school and problem are identified to assist in solving the problem.

Analysis means collecting and analyzing data about the problem selected during the scanning stage. During this stage, officers and stakeholders must ask a series of specific questions about the victim, suspect, and location of the problem or crime. What are the characteristics of the victim and suspect? Where and when does the problem occur? Officers must keep an open mind about the various kinds of data that might be useful in answering these questions. For example, they may conduct student or teacher surveys, conduct focus groups with students who are aware of the problems, or interview victims. Armed with useful data and insightful analysis, officers are often able to uncover information that is useful for developing creative response strategies.

Existing data from school disciplinary records, calls for service, and attendance might be analyzed more carefully than during the scanning phase. Environmental surveys might be conducted; these surveys require an observer to write down areas where students loiter, engage in fights, smoke, drink, or use drugs. Data from these surveys provide officers and partners with information about vulnerable or high-risk locations.

In the Response stage, officers and other problem-solvers use the information collected during the analysis stage in an attempt to solve (or reduce the scope of) the problem. In some instances, the response can constitute a single action (such as an arrest or expulsion). In other cases, the response may be a complicated, multifaceted strategy
that relies on the cooperation of police, students, faculty, and local residents. At this stage officers and stakeholders formulate short-term and long-term goals.

In the *Assessment* stage, the officer and problem solving team systematically examines the efficacy of its response strategy. Good assessments examine the duration of effectiveness. For instance, if police attempt to alleviate a problem of traffic tie-ups in the parking area by issuing citations over a short period, they should follow this up by determining how long it takes before the effects of the increased enforcement begin to diminish. If officers are to be measured based on problem solving, then supervisors must take this stage seriously. Officer and team performance can be measured by looking at the results of a second wave of surveys or changes over time with respect to calls for service, disciplinary action or other data used during the analysis phase.

In Appendix D we have provided a ‘scoring sheet’ for supervisors to use as they evaluate officer performance on POP projects. This is a simple tool that can be expanded to include more specific measures, if deemed necessary by the supervisor.

**Using Existing Numbers**

In our interviews, SROs and sergeants indicated that calls for service from the school and arrests by patrol officer *under-represented* the problems that occurred at the school. Because SROs are at the school, calls for service to 9-1-1 are lower than normal, as SROs are contacted by administrators, teachers, and students to handle problems. We acknowledge that this occurs, but calls for service still provide useful information about problems at the school. Some individuals might be unwilling to go directly to the SRO for assistance and 9-1-1 is still a viable option for those people.
Schools collect data on suspensions and expulsions. Some schools collect data on security problems not reported to the police. While we recognize that policies differ by district and by school, this information is important as the data reflect the overall safety and security of the school.

Recommendations

Based on our earlier evaluation of SROs under the problem solving partnership grant and our interviews with SROs and their supervisors we make the following recommendations.

Recommendation 1. Develop Strategic Plans

We recommend that Commanders, SRO Supervisors, SROs, and school partners develop an annual strategic plan for the SRO program. Much like a research design, a strategic plan maps out a course of action that is agreed upon by those involved in the SRO program. In this case, we are concerned about attaining the goals of making schools safe and secure. Each of the participants has their own agenda. But in order to avoid territorial disputes and challenges and conflicting agendas, participants need to agree about basic principles and values that supersede individual needs.

As a management consulting firm, we have found that strategic planning helps organizations to align their activities, core processes, and resources to support specific goals. The strategic plan provides a visible outline to everyone involved in the program, communicates the goals that will be attained, and holds people accountable for achieving these goals.

With a program that covers 12 high schools, five school districts, and a variety of police services, a strategic plan for the SRO program makes sense. We would suggest
two types of plans – a broad plan for the SRO program that would set broad goals and objectives, and individual plans for specific schools and SROs.

During a one-day strategic planning session a broad plan would be developed. A facilitator (from within the police department or schools) would assist in developing goals and objectives, coming up with a realistic timeline for completion of various tasks, and assigning people different tasks to fulfill. This allows for participation by all of the partners and provides buy-in to different ideas.

Smaller-scale strategic sessions would be conducted by supervisors, following the model established in the larger session. Supervisors would be responsible for assisting SROs in developing a plan for each of their schools. The idea is to promote thinking beyond the day-to-day issues that SROs and others are consumed with especially after school begins.

After the small-scale session, periodic meetings with the supervisors and SROs would be convened to discuss progress on different components of the individual plans. The meetings would encourage open communication, promote accountability, and encourage improvement. Outcome measures for different facets of the plan would be developed so that all parties would know what has been accomplished and what has not.

A second large meeting would be convened at the mid-point of the school year to assess progress and if necessary, re-tooling of goals and objectives.

**Recommendation 2. Provide support to SROs through a Problem Analyst.**

To assist SROs and others engaged in problem-oriented policing, a “Problem Analyst” position should be developed and implemented. The Problem Analyst (PA) would serve as a person who assists officers at different phases of the SARA process. In
particular, the person would assist during the identification of a problem type and collect and analyze data during the analysis and assessment phases. The following list, while not completely inclusive of all tasks, gives a good approximation of things to consider when engaging in a POP project. Some of these responsibilities could be part of the Problem Analyst position, but are also part of the SRO position. (We identify the person with primary responsibility in parenthesis):

- Working with police supervisors, officers, crime analysis staff, the community and others to identify and select problems for consideration (SRO and PA);
- Documenting the history of the problem, including current and past responses to it (PA);
- Helping to identify all the stakeholders (SRO);
- Ensuring that enough stakeholders participate so that most perspectives are represented throughout the project and that allows for sporadic participation (SRO);
- Ensuring that some documentation occurs during the early phases of the project (number of meetings, who attended, the complete range of ideas that were suggested, the types of individuals who were part of these meetings or focus groups) (PA);
- Ensuring an appropriate distribution of tasks across stakeholders (SRO);
- Researching how the problem has been handled locally, regionally, within the state and nationally (PA);
- Facilitating sessions with stakeholders to make sure the appropriate questions are asked, who should answer the questions, and how the questions should be answered while at the same time guiding the stakeholders to insure the questions are not beyond the scope of a particular problem (SRO);
- Compiling and interpreting information about the problem and ensuring the information is easy to understand (PA);
- Documenting findings that lead to changes in problem definition (PA);
- Documenting the specific findings that helped determine a response (PA);
- Ensuring the ability to capture appropriate information after the response that may measure change (PA);
- Collecting information routinely on events that do not make it to the official police incident reports, especially assisting officers in documenting incidents that were prevented and incidents that were less serious due to officer involvement (PA);
- Looking for community information sources on the specific or secondary problems; if other information sources do not exist, leading the development of simple, quick (two weeks to two months) data collection strategies (PA);
• Facilitating a list of possible tailored responses generated by the project team (SRO);
• Researching the likelihood of the response’s impact, feasibility, short- and long-term costs (PA);
• Ensuring that the responses try to include sections directed at victims, locations, and offenders or explain why the element was not included (SRO);
• Facilitating the final selection of responses by the project team (SRO);
• Ensuring that the implemented responses are appropriately documented, such as start and end dates, obstacles to response implementation and how the obstacles affect the project outcome (PA);
• Ensuring that the assessment phase of the project is completed and used as a guide to improving future problem-solving efforts (SRO, Sgt., PA).

The Problem Analyst would also ensure that other information sources are used, especially regarding repeat and high-risk offenders. Potential sources include the gang database, reviewing the Habitual Offender list, information about students being tracked by the Department of Probation and Parole, PRO or security intelligence on students graduating from middle schools who may be high risk or repeat offenders, checking the records of transfer students, and conducting regular reviews of calls for service around the schools. These information sources would be reviewed to locate repeat offenders, repeat victims and/or repeat locations that might be worthy of opening a POP project.

**Recommendation 3. Implement the student and teacher surveys annually.** By collecting information from students and teachers over time, as was done in the New Hampshire study, we can obtain a long-term view of the effectiveness of the SRO and the overall program. These data measure perceptions and should be used in conjunction with other data to obtain a full picture of SRO work.

**Recommendation 4. Convene annual or semi-annual meetings with commanders, supervisor, and SROs.** In our interviews we found that SROs and supervisors had
limited information about what other SROs and supervisors were doing. Sharing information about issues, challenges, and solutions, would assist all parties. In addition, a general meeting prior to and at the end of the school year would allow for more uniformity regarding the SRO program. All SROs would be aware of general expectations for the group.
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Appendix A: Student Survey
2002 School Safety Survey - Students

This survey is about safety in schools. It has been developed so you can tell us what you think about school safety. The information you give will be used to develop safer schools for young people like yourself.

DO NOT write your name on this survey. The answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write. Answer the questions based on what you really do or really think.

Completing the survey is voluntary. Whether or not you answer the questions will not affect your grades. If you are not comfortable answering a question, just leave it blank.

The questions that ask about your background will be used only to describe the types of students completing this survey. The information will not be used to find out your name. No names will ever be reported.

Make sure to read every question. When you are finished, follow the instructions of the person giving you the survey.

Thank you very much for your help.

Directions

Use a pencil.
Circle the best answer.
To change your answer, erase completely.

1. How old are you?
   a. 13 years old or younger
   b. 14 years old
   c. 15 years old
   d. 16 years old
   e. 17 years old or older

2. What is your sex?
   a. Female   b. Male

3. In what grade are you?
   a. 9th grade
   b. 10th grade
   c. 11th grade
   d. 12th grade

4. How do you describe yourself? (Select one or more responses.)
   a. American Indian or Alaska Native
   b. Asian American
   c. Black or African American
   d. Hispanic or Latino
   e. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
   f. White
5. During the past 12 months, how would you describe your grades in school?
   a. Mostly A's
   b. Mostly B's
   c. Mostly C's
   d. Mostly D's
   e. Mostly F's
   f. None of these grades
   g. Not sure

6. How safe do you feel at school (circle one)?
   a. Always feel safe
   b. More safe than unsafe
   c. Half safe/half unsafe
   d. More unsafe than safe
   e. Never feel safe

7. Have you ever felt so unsafe that you thought about bringing a weapon to school?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   If yes, what type of weapon:
      a. razor blade
      b. knife
      c. gun
      d. other (what kind?): __________

8. Have you ever felt so unsafe that you actually brought a weapon to school?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   If yes, what type of weapon:
      a. razor blade
      b. knife
      c. gun
      d. other (what kind?): __________

9. What parts of the school do you feel are unsafe (Circle all that apply)? What time do you feel that the location is unsafe (please give a specific time in the space after the location—Example: Locker Rooms: 3 p.m.)?
   a. Classrooms: _____
   b. Hallways: _____
   c. Locker Rooms: _____
   d. Main Entrance: _____
   e. Restrooms: _____
   f. Stairwells: _____
   g. Other area (Where and what time?): _________________
   h. There are no areas where I feel unsafe

The next few questions ask about the School Resource Officer (SRO) assigned to your school.

10. Do you know your SRO’s name?
   a. Yes
   b. No
11. What is his/her name? ____________________________________________

12. How many times have you had a conversation with your SRO?
   a. Never
   b. Once
   c. Twice
   d. Three or four times
   e. Five or more times

13. If you had a problem in school related to bullying or fighting, how comfortable would you feel discussing it with your SRO?
   a. Very Comfortable
   b. Comfortable
   c. Neutral
   d. Uncomfortable
   e. Very Uncomfortable

14. Has the SRO spoken in your class about violence or school safety?
   a. Yes
   b. No

15. Please tell us in your own words what you think can be done to make your school a safer place.

______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
Appendix B: Teacher/Staff Survey
2002 School Safety Survey -- Teachers

This survey is about safety in schools. It has been developed so you can tell us what you think about school safety. The information you give will be used to develop safer schools for young people like yourself.

DO NOT write your name on this survey. The answers you give will be kept private. No one will know what you write. Answer the questions based on what you really do or really think.

Completing the survey is voluntary. If you are not comfortable answering a question, just leave it blank.

The questions that ask about your background will be used only to describe the types of teachers completing this survey. The information will not be used to find out your name. No names will ever be reported.

Make sure to read every question. When you are finished, follow the instructions of the person giving you the survey.

Thank you very much for your help.

Directions
- Use a pencil.
- Circle the best answer.
- To change your answer, erase completely.

1. Please put a check mark in the box indicating to what extent, if any, each of the following has been a problem in this school during the 2001-2002 school year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Type</th>
<th>Serious 1</th>
<th>Moderate 2</th>
<th>Minor 3</th>
<th>Not a problem 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Tardiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student absenteeism/cutting class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical conflicts among students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery or theft of items over $10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vandalism of school property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student alcohol use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student drug use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tobacco use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student possession of weapons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal abuse of teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gangs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. What has been done (to your knowledge) about these problems?
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________

3. How safe do you feel at school (please circle one)?
a. Always feel safe
b. More safe than unsafe
c. Half safe/half unsafe
d. More unsafe than safe
e. Never feel safe

4. What parts of the school do you feel are unsafe (please circle all that apply)? What time do you feel that the location is unsafe (please give a specific time in the space after the location—Example: Locker rooms: 3 p.m.)?
   a. Classrooms ____
   b. Hallways ____
   c. Locker Rooms ____
   d. Main Entrance ____
   e. Restrooms ____
   f. Stairwells ____
   g. Other area (Where?): ______________
   h. There are no areas where I feel unsafe.

5. What has been done (to your knowledge) about these problem areas?
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________________________

The next few questions ask about the School Resource Officer (SRO) assigned to your school.

6. Do you know your SRO’s name?
a. Yes
b. No

7. What is his/her name? ________________________________

8. How many times have you had a conversation with your SRO?
a. Never
b. Once
c. Twice
d. Three or four times
e. Five or more times
9. If you had a problem in your classroom or elsewhere in the school, how comfortable would you feel discussing it with your SRO?
   a. Very Comfortable
   b. Comfortable
   c. Neutral
   d. Uncomfortable
   e. Very Uncomfortable

10. Has the SRO spoken in your class about violence or school safety?
   a. Yes
   b. No

11. Please tell us in what you think can be done to make your school a safer place.

   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
Appendix C: Administration Questionnaire
Appendix D: POP Evaluation Form
Review Sheet of School-Based POP project for Supervisors

Officer Name _______________________  Other Officers Involved?  Y  N  Names of others
____________________________

Problem Type _______________________

Project Start Date ______________    Project End Date ______________

Location of the Project ______________

Stakeholders selected?  Y  N  Names of Stakeholders ______________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The officer completed the information sheet thoroughly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer identified the problem proactively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer used data to identify the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer(s) consulted with the appropriate agencies and people to handle this problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer analyzed data to identify the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer appears to have engaged in a creative thinking process to identify a potential response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer(s) dropped this problem by referring it to another agency without follow-up.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer identified the root cause of the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The response(s) appeared creative and well thought-out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer responded using only traditional police tactics.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer worked together with external entities to resolve this problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer(s) involved in the POP project felt the problem was solved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer conducted a formal assessment of the response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer conducted an informal assessment of the response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The officer conducted no assessment of the response.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use this space for comments and suggestions: